



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ment of which the book was written, its non-controversial chapters, which make up three-quarters of the volume, undoubtedly present the best account of the movements in the battle of Franklin yet published.

The discussion of the division of Sherman's forces when he decided to leave Hood in his rear for Thomas to deal with, while with all his army except two small corps, the convalescents, and the sick, he started for the sea, is seriously marred by withholding several essential elements without which there can be no fair presentation of the case. For example, the force which Sherman took to the sea is stated at "about 50,000." Sherman himself in his *Memoirs* says it was 62,204, that "the most extraordinary efforts had been made to purge the army," and "that all on this exhibit may be assumed to have been able-bodied, experienced soldiers, well armed, well equipped and provided, as far as human foresight could, with all the essentials of life, strength, and vigorous action." On the other hand, of those sent back to Thomas, the terms of service of 15,000 expired within a week after Hood's movement began, and their places were in part supplied with 12,000 perfectly new troops. It was necessary to ransack the hospitals and organize convalescents for the field, and also, at last, to put citizens and quartermasters' employés into the ranks, and Thomas, when the real situation was discovered at Washington, was urged to send north for militia. While this was the condition confronting Thomas, and while both Schofield and Thomas reported officially that at the time of Franklin Hood largely outnumbered the Union force, General Cox gives Hood's strength as 42,000 or 43,000, and asserts that "The effective force under General Thomas, in middle and southern Tennessee, was 65,000 officers and men present for duty equipped, which was the official phrase indicating complete readiness for active service." This single statement, in the light of the facts given above, to which he makes no reference, should dispose of his book as history; and also of the theory which General Cox advances that the writing of his book is justified by the demonstration which Franklin gives that Sherman made a proper division of his army when he marched away from Hood to the sea.

H. V. BOYNTON.

*Report and Accompanying Papers of the Commission appointed by the President of the United States "to investigate and report upon the true divisional Line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana."* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897. Four vols., pp. 406, 723, 517; Vol. IV., atlas of 76 plates.)

THESE volumes may be considered as products of American scholarship, apart entirely from the policy that gave rise to them. They are undoubtedly the best contribution hitherto made towards clearing up the merits of the boundary dispute. This indeed is not very high praise, for the previous contributions, at least the official ones, were not of the highest order. The interminable series of "statements," "cases" and

“memoranda” put forward by Venezuelan agents have in them lamentably little that is at once relevant to the question and useful towards deciding it. The “case” for the English colony, on the other hand, was tardily scrambled together under pressure of threatened war. It was based on insufficient research, made by persons who had had no thorough training in selecting and translating significant passages from foreign records, to say nothing of the higher task of collating and sifting the evidence so obtained. As a result, Sir Frederick Pollock’s able and temperate statement was in part vitiated at the outset by defects in his materials. It was also of course a one-sided presentation. There was still, therefore, need of a thorough search of the sources and a review of the evidence by competent hands; and this the members of our Commission have evidently sought to bring about. They were fortunate in their choice for the most difficult part of the undertaking, of Professor George Lincoln Burr as their agent. Valuable service was done by Professor J. F. Jameson in investigating the beginnings of European settlement in Guiana; and by Mr. Mallet-Prevost, the late Dr. Winsor and Mr. Marcus Baker in working up the geographical features of the question. But it is no injustice to these others to say that the most important and valuable contents of these volumes come from Professor Burr.

Our worthy Secretary of State who asserted that the Guiana boundary question was a matter of “weighing simple historical evidence” ought, in poetical justice, to have been required to do the weighing himself. I doubt whether all history could supply an example of more baffling, complicated and unsatisfactory evidence. The evidence of tradition is conflicting and shadowy. Records are vague and full of gaps, important maps are lost, sites of former occupation cannot be definitely fixed. The disputed territory has for landmarks almost exclusively rivers, and every river has either several names (Indian, Spanish, Dutch, French, English) or several ways of spelling what is supposed to be one and the same name. Many rivers have names so nearly alike that everything depends on a single letter. There is a Baroma and a Barama and a Barima and a Barimani; all four are neighboring streams. The name of the first is spelled in at least twenty-five different ways, and the rest have variations of their own. The second and third are at the burning point of the boundary controversy. To add to this charming simplicity, the map-makers frequently interchanged the name of the Barima with its neighbor the Amacura; and when a document represents the Barima as the boundary of Dutch territory it may be quite uncertain which river is intended.

In unravelling the tangle of tangles in which the geography of the disputed region is involved, Professor Burr has performed some really remarkable feats. For example, the identification of “Creek Mejou” in a Dutch document, with the river Curumu (Vol. I., p. 390); or, for an example of insight, sustained alertness and skill in marshalling detached bits of evidence, take the processes by which he determines approximately the sites of the successive Dutch posts on the Cuyuni—that river of the interior which figures so much in the boundary dispute. I wish it

were possible to quote the passage in which he speaks of Schomburgk's Indian tradition as fixing the site of one of these posts and giving the name of the post-holder, "Palmsteen." The site is now shown, by a record which Schomburgk could not have seen, to have been correctly indicated by tradition, and Mr. Burr, recalling the Indian tendency to mix l's and r's, reconciles "Palmsteen" with the true name, *Pierre Martin*, preserved in the record (Vol. I., p. 344).

In his efforts to clear up the facts of occupation from stage to stage, it seems to me Professor Burr has been eminently successful. Unless new evidence be discovered, it is doubtful whether anything further can be drawn from the materials now available. His arguments and inferences as to territorial claims are less likely to be accepted by everybody concerned. As to the primary question whether the Dutch legislators used the Orinoco river as a limit of their territorial rights, possessions or jurisdiction, I think he has not succeeded in overturning the essential part of the case for the colony. He has, indeed, supplied some important corrections in the copying and translating of the chief documents ; but the fact remains that Dutch legislation made a distinction between the region east of the Orinoco and the region west of it ; that for "the Wild Coast" east of it they legislated freely as to founding colonies, undertaking to authorize and govern settlements at any point settlers might select ; west of the Orinoco they made no such pretensions. And when Professor Burr contends that when the Orinoco is thus named as a limit in Dutch legislation about Dutch affairs, "it is as the first Spanish point, and not as the last Dutch one, that it is named," he seems to me to come dangerously near to mere hair-splitting. First Spanish point or last Dutch point, it amounts to a denial of Spanish sovereignty and an assertion of Dutch rights east of the Orinoco. Mr. Burr argues much from the fact that the Dutch did not at once assert an *exclusive* right to plant colonies in Guiana ; but I think he looks too much at mere words and too little at the facts. Mere verbal assertion of exclusive sovereignty would have been of small value in 1621 ; the only assertion that could avail was actual occupation of various points on the coast. It seems to me also that even verbal assertion of exclusive sovereignty is plainly enough contained in the company's "conditions for colonies" of 1627-8 ; I hardly see how it could be more strongly stated. However that may be, it seems not worth while to spend much time on the question, unless we are to maintain that the situation was controlled to the end by the phrases of 1621. It will hardly be suggested that Holland, to the close of her hold on western Guiana, would have allowed any other country to plant a colony on its coast, without resistance ! If not, it seems to me that any argument from the terms of early documents, however interesting historically, is of little value for present purposes. Mr. Burr's own researches would seem to warrant the opinion that if British Guiana fails to get the boundary placed near to the Orinoco it will not be for lack of evidence that the Dutch claimed exclusive jurisdiction up to that limit.

The treatment of the evidence of geographers occupies the whole of Volume III. Here Professor Burr contributes a paper on such official or semi-official maps as he was able to find. His work in hunting down maps officially referred to, and in using their contents, deserves the highest recognition. Dr. Winsor's paper on the history of the boundaries as shown on various classes of maps is clear and good, but somewhat too general for definiteness of results. Mr. Mallet-Prevost, secretary of the Commission, presents a longer, but, as it seems to me, not wholly satisfactory paper on the same ground. He gives too much the impression of laboring to break the force of the map evidence that runs so strongly against Venezuela. Lack of space forbids discussion here of the theory he maintains as to the origin of the Sanson line, the D'Anville line, etc. Even granting all that he contends for, the fact remains that the great majority of reputable map-makers long held that Spain's territory ended at or near the mouth of the Orinoco. Whether they did or did not mean to assign the territory east of the Spanish boundary to the Dutch (and it is quite clear that most of them did) their evidence cannot be brushed aside by unsupported conjecture; they represent the common report and prevailing impression of their day as to the state of territorial rights in that part of the world. It is as futile as it is unfair to assume that the geographers used nothing but old maps in making new ones. There is a very considerable body of literature which was available and was certainly used in the drawing of maps. It would have been well if the best of it, so far as pertinent, had been included within the scope of the Commission's inquiries. The geographers were aware that Spain had settlements up the Orinoco but none on the coast. They knew that Holland had settlements on the coast and was reputed to claim it to the neighborhood of the Orinoco. A "line" they could hardly avoid drawing, and where would it so well accord with facts as when drawn at the point where river-bank meets sea-coast? The direction inland was, I think, an arbitrary matter; nobody knew anything of the country and probably D'Anville meant to halve the angle between coast-line and river-line. But he certainly had no thought of setting himself up as "a judge and a divider" over the Spanish and the Dutch. The accordance of his line with the known facts seems to have satisfied both himself and his successors,—at least those who did not set up preconceived theory above facts. There were some who assigned to Spain all the territory in South America that no other country had actually occupied; these drew the boundary at the Pomeroon. There were others, few and obscure, who were disposed to deny, with the Venezuelans, that any other country could obtain ownership of any part without Spain's express grant; these, interpreting the treaty of 1648 in their own way, drew the line at the Essequibo, thus placing a part of the Dutch colony in Spanish territory. It is, however, somewhat surprising to find Bonne and Poirson put in this group as having "denied to the Dutch any rights whatever west of the Essequibo." Of some six or seven maps of this region by Bonne, just one, the one reproduced in the Commission's atlas, a small-scale general

map of South America, may bear this construction, though not of necessity. At all events, all the other maps by Bonne give at least the Pomeroon to the Dutch, and one puts the boundary at the Orinoco (*Atlas Moderne*, Paris, 1771). And as to Poirson, the only authority for placing him in this list is a German map attributed to him, which has no engraved boundary at the coast. All the genuine Poirson maps, printed from his own plates, concede the Pomeroon basin to the Dutch; and even this doubtful German translation shows the Dutch New Middelburg, etc., west of the hand-colored boundary.

Mr. Baker's laudable work in writing a geographical description of Guiana, and in listing the known maps of the region, suffered most by the sudden interruption of the Commission's labors. It is to be hoped he may be authorized to complete his project, and to include in it the evidence of historians, travellers and others who have left on record any word that bears on the main question.

The point most likely to interest readers of this review is, I suppose, the general bearing of the work done for the Commission on the respective claims of Venezuela and British Guiana. That is a matter of opinion. While some of the grounds on which the colonists base their case are shown to be untenable, other grounds are strengthened. The gross result is, as it ought to be, rather to help the arbitrators than to help either party. One feature of the work has seemed to me somewhat unfortunate in this view. The general course and tone of the writing run much as a hostile criticism of the British case. This was perhaps inevitable from the circumstances. It may have been the intention to submit the Venezuelan case to a similar course of critical examination; but there is unfortunately nothing in these volumes to indicate such an intention. Yet the whole work, in spite of this feature, casts a curious light on the extravagant statements once current here as to "English expansion" of claims beyond those made by the Dutch.

S. M. MACVANE.

In Vol. XI. of the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (Longmans, pp. 212) the most noteworthy pieces are four: Professor York Powell's account of the *École des Chartes* and plea for a similar institution in England; Major Martin A. S. Hume's narrative, presenting the most recent information concerning some of the survivors of the Armada who went ashore in Ireland; Mr. W. J. Corbett's very interesting account of some Elizabethan village surveys, derived from the muniments of King's College, Cambridge, and relating chiefly to lands in Norfolk; and Rev. J. Neville Figgis's article on some political theories of the early Jesuits. Mr. I. S. Leadam prints a document describing the pursuit of certain of the English refugees on the Continent by emissaries of Queen Mary. Mr. Oscar Browning casts some new light on the conference of Pillnitz, derived from the letters of Morton Eden, English minister at Dresden, to his brother Lord Auckland, minister at the Hague. Mr. W. F. Lord gives a history of Goree. It is not yet time for the fruits of the society's